Trans-Lake Washington Project

Multi-Modal Alternatives Analysis Conclusions

June 2001

Multi-Modal Alternatives Analysis Conclusions

4 Lane Alternatives:

- Improve safety/reliability in the corridor
- Replace aging/substandard structures in the corridor
  - Floating section
  - Seismically substandard sections
- Provide bicycle/pedestrian facilities the length of the corridor
- Does not significantly increase capacity in the corridor
- Should be included in the EIS due to level of impacts

Multi-Modal Alternatives Analysis Conclusions

6 Lane Alternatives:

- Improve safety/reliability in the corridor
- Provide bicycle/pedestrian facilities the length of the corridor
- Improve flow in the corridor due to separating movements
- Provide improved travel times for HOV/transit users
- Environmental impacts, costs, become more apparent
- Does not significantly increase vehicle throughput across the lake
- Local access may need some modification
- Should be included in the EIS

Multi-Modal Alternatives Analysis Conclusions

8 Lane Alternatives:

- Provide bicycle/pedestrian facilities the length of the corridor
- Person and vehicular throughput significantly increased over other alternatives
- Local access is more problematic than other alternatives
- Highest level of impacts to the natural environment, and to local arterials
- Higher costs
- Added traffic at I-5 problematic
- QUESTIONS REMAIN……..

Multi-Modal Alternatives Analysis Conclusions

BRT/HOV:

- Person throughput similar to HCT alternatives over next 20 years
- Beyond 20 years BRT faces capacity constraints in downtown Seattle, University District, and possibly downtown Bellevue

High Capacity Transit:

- Both I-90 and SR 520 meet long-term transit capacity needs
- Ridership very similar across I-90 and SR 520

Trans-Lake Washington Project

Multi-Modal Alternatives Analysis Conclusions

High Capacity Transit (continued):

- SR 520 route provides additional north-south capacity into downtown
  - Cannot merge with LINK connection
    - Transfer is accommodated
- I-90 route takes advantage of existing infrastructure investments
  - Across the lake
  - Between the lake and downtown Seattle
  - In the downtown tunnel
- QUESTIONS REMAIN……..

What Additional Questions Need to be Addressed?

Q: How do the other large corridor projects integrate with SR 520 as a system?

- I-90; I-405; LINK, I-5 lane?

Q: What are the light rail options on I-90?

- Additional model runs; Pricing as a means to control volumes?
- Sound Transit decisions on geometric assessment/ federal concurrence
- Parallel crossing?

Q: Should right-of-way for HCT be preserved in the SR 520 corridor?

- NEPA questions?
- Costs?

Additional Questions - continued

Q: What other options are available to deal with local traffic impacts?

- May require grade separation at:
  - Eastlake/Fairview?
  - Montlake/Pacific?
  - Other Eastside arterial locations?
- May require widening at:
  - Union Hill Road?
  - Leary Way?
  - 148th?
  - Redmond Way?
  - W. Lake Sammamish?
  - Lake Washington Blvd (E)?
- May require local access reduction at:
  - 108th/Northup Way?
  - NE 124th?

Additional Questions - continued

Q: What other options are available/reasonable to handle volumes at I-5?

- Different connection/termini assumptions?
- Widening on I-5?
- Pricing as a method to control volumes?

Q: What other options are available in the I-405 area?

- Effect of added capacity on I-405?
- Maintain movements in every direction?
- Consolidation between 108th and 124th?

Next Steps for Committees

- Advisory Committee meets June 18
- Technical Committee meets June 19
- Executive Committee meets June 27
- Additional Committee discussion of multi-modal evaluation results and questions to be answered